DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 669 FL 013 527

TITLE Planning for Evaluation Design: Basic Concepts in Design. Participant's Handbook. Bilingual Evaluation Technical Assistance Workshop IIA.

INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. Center for the Study of Evaluation.

PUB DATE 82

NOTE 36p.; For related documents, see ED 221 565-569, FL 013 523-524, FL 013 526-529, FL 013 531-532, FL 013 534-535, and FL 013 537-538.

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Materials (For Learner) (051)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education Programs; Evaluation Methods; Guides; Instructional Materials; Learning Activities; *Program Evaluation; Technical Assistance; *Workshops

IDENTIFIERS *Bilingual Evaluation Technical Assistance Project

ABSTRACT

A participant's handbook for the workshop on basic concepts in evaluation design provides instructions and worksheets for the workshop activities. The handbook is accompanied by a workshop text. The workshop is the second of five 4-hour evaluation workshops designed to meet the basic information needs of teachers, administrators, evaluators, and researchers involved in bilingual education. The other four workshops cover an overview of bilingual program evaluation, student testing and assessment, implementation evaluation, and evaluation management. The five workshop activities involve (1) identifying the threats to validity inherent in a simulated bilingual evaluation, (2) formulating the necessary evaluation questions for bilingual programs, (3) distinguishing between evaluation questions that address program implementation and outcomes, and (4) creating a sampling and implementation plan for evaluation questions (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED227669

Bilingual Evaluation Technical Assistance

Workshop IIA

Planning for Evaluation Design:

Basic Concept in Design

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CSE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Participants' Handbook

FL013527

Center for the Study of Evaluation

The mission of the Center for the Study of Evaluation is to conduct inquiry, from a variety of perspectives, into the nature of educational programs and services. Our commitment to inquiry into the field of evaluation grows from the belief that school practices and the competencies and satisfactions of those who participate in the educational enterprise can benefit from information collected in accordance with social science methodologies. Activities of CSE involve study of the instruments and methodologies for collecting information as well as the sociopolitical contexts of educational decisions as a means of contributing to the long-range growth in effectiveness of public education.

Information about CSE and its publications may be obtained by writing to:

Director, Public Information
Center for the Study of Evaluation
UCLA Graduate School of Education
Los Angeles, California 90024

Table of Contents

Page

Workshop Activities:

Workshop A: Basic Concepts in Design

Activity #1: Identifying threats to validity (a) 1

Activity #2: Identifying threats to validity (b) 9

Activity #3: Identifying the necessary questions 12

Activity #4: Specifying implementation and outcome questions . 15

Activity #5: Creating sampling and instrumentation plan . . . 18

Workshop Objectives

1) Identify the threats to validity inherent in a simulated bilingual evaluation .

2) Formulate evaluation questions for a "typical" bilingual program.

3) Classify evaluation questions as to their focus on either program implementation aspects or outcomes.

4) Create a sampling and instrumentation plan for given evaluation questions.

ACTIVITY 1: IDENTIFYING THREATS TO VALIDITY

In this activity, review The Applegate Evaluation as if you were a member of the School Board and not especially in favor of special programs of any kind.

- Identify questions that the evaluator failed to address.
- Identify procedures that appear to you to be questionable.
- Think of competing explanations for the results reported.
- Think of how you might question the evaluator's conclusions.

1) Questions that the evaluator w ould have asked:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2) Questionable procedures:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3) Possible competing explanations for results:

4) Weaknesses in evaluator's conclusions:

The Applegate Evaluation

Dr. Z conducted an evaluation of the bilingual program in the Applegate School District. The program was funded by Title VII and was one of several special programs serving the school including Title I, the Happy Days Tutorial After School Program for 3rd grade students of working parents and the Teacher Growth Project which provided free courses and salary credit.

Dr. Z used the following instruments for the evaluation:

1) The TUF Achievement Test Battery: English and Spanish versions of reading and math achievement tests. The English section of the TUF tests vocabulary, reading comprehension, mechanics, spelling, and expression; the Spanish only vocabulary and mechanics. Math sections are comparable. Norms are provided for October and April testing periods.
2) A teacher questionnaire indicating attitude toward the bilingual program, type of inservice courses and number of reading and math units completed by each student.

Methods

Pretests were given to all 3rd grade students enrolled in the bilingual program, approximately 650, during the second week in September. Students chose either the English or Spanish version of the reading and math tests at their own grade level.

At the end of the year, the first week in June, students were retested on the TUF battery. Only 400 students took the posttest battery.

Tests were assigned to students by teachers, who were by now able to judge whether students would perform better if given English or Spanish versions. In addition, the teachers assigned test grade levels to their classes according to which level matched their teaching objectives, rather than simply choosing the "correct grade level. Teachers also completed the questionnaire.

Results

The pre-post achievement gains were analyzed by subtracting the mean pretest grade equivalent score for each grade from the mean posttest GE score for students taking the test in English and then for those taking it in Spanish. A t-test between pre-post test means was done for each comparison: all gains were significant. Table 1 shows the results.

	Reading		Language		Math		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
English	1.5	2.3	2.0	2.3	2.0	3.3	2.0	2.5
Spanish	1.0	3.0	----------		2.0	3.3	2.0	2.5

Teacher questionnaire data indicated that the average teacher (n=5) took 1.5 courses during the year, "enjoyed" teaching in the program, and covered 15 reading units (range 2-30) and 15 math units (range 10-20).

Recommendations

Dr. Z concluded that Appledale's 3rd grade bilingual program was very successful in meeting its goals. He suggested that the district export its model to other programs because of the level of student achievement and teacher satisfaction with the program.

OVERHEAD -- ACTIVITY 1: IDENTIFYING THREATS TO VALIDITY

Questions the evaluator should have asked

1. What are the objectives of the bilingual program?
2. What is being taught in the bilingual program?
3. Which program objectives are tested by the TUF and which are not?
4. How were students assigned to the program? Which students must be assessed in English, which in Spanish?
5. What kinds of students left the program and why?
6. Where are the exited students; can they be posttested?
7. What does "in service" consist of? What is taught? How does it relate to what you must do in your bilingual classroom?
8. What provision is made for parent involvement?
9. What is your program descirption and implementation plan?

Questionable Procedures

1. Pretest not given on empirical norming dates -- you should check.
2. Reliance on student judgement as to which test to take.
3. Different assignment procedure of tests to students for posttest. You need same version of test for individual students in order to make pre-post comparisons.
4. Need to observe classrooms in addition to asking teachers what went on.
5. Use of grade equivalent scores for making comparisons among tests and for doing statistical calculations. Need to use scale scores or normal curve equivalents for this purpose.

6. Using the mean to describe the average number of units covered in reading and math when the mode or median might better describe "typical" coverage. You have to look at the data to see what's best.

Competing Explanations

1. The students who remained in the program were the "better" students and not typical of those for whom the program was designed.
2. Giving tests before and after the empirical norming dates "inflated" growth comparisons.
3. Students could have been tested with a lower grade level posttest which would be "easier" than the grade level pretest.
4. Student and teacher attitudes toward school could have been affected by the Happy Days Afterschool Program or the Teacher Growth Project.

Weaknesses in the Evaluator's Conclusions

1. Can't attribute student achievement to the program due to poor test administration practice.
2. Can't attribute teacher and student attitude toward the program due to competing programs that may be responsible for it.
3. The evaluator did not ask about program goals so cannot say program was successful in achievement of goals.
4. There is no evidence that there was a "program". If so, what was it? How can it be exported when it is an unknown?

Reading:

THREATS TO VALIDITY

The Sample

Selection. Selection refers to the representativeness of the student groups about which you will generalize. Are students in the program like bilingual populations about which you are asked to make conclusions? Are students in comparison groups similar?

Maturation. During the course of the school year, students grow older with concommitant growth in cognitive and motor skills. As a child grows older, cognitive functioning and language development grow, regardless of formal instruction. Thus, achievement might be attributed to program interventions when, in fact, it is simply a result of maturation.

Mortality. Some student subpopulations are particularly susceptible to dropping out or leaving school. When they are enrolled in the program at the beginning but leave before final evaluations, the children who remain may be different in background, abilities, and language proficiency than the original group. Children of migrant workers, military people, recent immigrants, may be enrolled in the program and then leave. Exited students also fall into this category. You must be aware of who is leaving the program and why in order to make your inferences about program accurate.

Instruments

Validity. Threats to an evaluation stemming from instrument invalidity occur because you either have a mismatch between what the instrument samples and program objectives and/or you make incorrect inferences from test scores. You say more than the test interview/questionnaire allows. Validity is a function of tost use--it depends on selecting tests with appropriate difficulty levels, unbiased item content, appropriate norm group comparisons, and standardized administration and scoring procedures.

Reliability. A reliable instrument is both stable and fairly accurate. Scores will not change markedly on repeated test occasions or score estimates have small amounts of measurement error and closely approximate "true" performance levels. Extremely high or low test scores tend to "regress" toward the mean of the population which the sample group represents. On a second testing, you would expect the lowest scorers to do better and the highest to do worse simple because measurement error operated more on these "lucky" or "unlucky" extreme scores than on scores clustered toward the middle of the distribution.

Timing. Timing of testing affects test results. If pretests and posttests are scheduled too close together in time, student performance may reflect the influence of memory rather than learning. The same is true if the same test form is used repeatedly with the same group of students. Translated tests given to the same group of students in both English and the native language may also reflect "testing" effects.

Another consideration related to test timing is the empirical norming

dates of the tests. If you need standardized, norm-referenced test data for the evaluation, you should administer the test within two weeks, either side, of the empirical norming dates of the test. If you need pre and posttest data, you need tests with two empirical norming dates.

Extraneous Factors

It is quite likely that students are involved in non-program activities that may contribute to their progress on program objectives. Schools with federally funded bilingual programs often receive funds for Title I or state titles in which bilingual students are concurrently enrolled. At the secondary level, bilingual students may be taking mainstream courses in the same subjects as their bilingual courses. When students are simultaneously involved in several programs with similar or complementary goals, it is difficult to attribute gains to only one of the programs.

ACTIVITY 2: IDENTIFYING THREATS TO VALIDITY

Read the following brief sketches and tell whether the threat to validity is from 1) Sample, 2) Instrumentation or 3) Extraneous factors. If you can, try to identify the specific type of threat illustrated.

Evaluation 1: Parent Involvement

Dr. W. Wishes to evaluate the effectiveness of the parent involvement component of Appledale's bilingual program. Two comparison groups are created. One group is comprised of parents of children enrolled in Appledale's program; the comparison group is parents from Orangedale's bilingual program which enrolls similar students. Because of time and money constraints, Dr. W. cannot visit all homes to interview program parents in the two groups. Instead, he sends a letter (in English) to parents of both groups to attend a meeting where a parent involvement questionnaire will be distributed and completed. The meeting will be held in the Appledale auditorium on a Wednesday night (Bowling league night).

Results of the parent survey indicate that parent attitude toward the program and perception of child achievement is the same in both programs, regardless of the differences in the parent involvement plan.

Evaluation 2: Fidelity to Implementation Plan

The project director of Orangedale's bilingual math program has hired an evaluator to determine if during this very first year of the program, it is being implemented as intended. Dr. A. has a list of

program objectives, materials, a course of study, and has talked with the director about the program's philosophy and teaching strategies. Knowing that continuing contact with the program is important, Dr. A. attends all project staff meetings (15 in the school year) as an observer. Teachers are asked to complete a survey asking what materials they used, what strategies they preferred, how they liked them, and how well they thought students did. Students were given an end of year survey that asked them to evaluate their materials and the teacher's strategies. Dr. A. concluded that the program was being implemented as intended. Additionally, she found that when teachers liked their strategies and materials, students did too and when they were uncomfortable with either or both, so were their students. She recommended that teachers be allowed to choose their own approaches to bilingual education and their own materials.

Evaluation 3: Achievement Gains in English Reading

The objective of Project 121's bilingual reading program was to improve student achievement in English reading by teaching reading in the native languages. Once literacy was achieved, English reading would be taught. In order to comply with federal and state funding requirements, students were assessed in reading in the native language at the beginning of the school year and the end. Students were also assessed in English reading at the end of each school year with a grade level test that matched the particular English reading objectives taught that year. Interestingly enough, results showed that English reading did not improve until students

Reading:

BASIC FEATURES OF DESIGN

Three powerful concepts will enable you to counter many competing explanations for evaluation results: comparison, controlled assignment and multiple designs.

Comparison

Under ideal circumstances, the evaluator finds two or more typical bilingual populations, one in a bilingual program and another in the regular program. Other than the special program, all background abilities and experiences of the groups are the same. Any differences between the two groups found could be attributed to program differences. The existence of two equal populations, one in a bilingual program and the other not, is an impossibility.

Controlled Assignment

While you will not be able to find groups with identical characteristics for comparison purposes, you may use a process that insures both groups have similar characteristics and resemble with only chance variations the general diversity that commonly occurs in the population they represent. This procedure is called random assignment. The notion behind random assignment is that any member of the population has an equal chance of being selected to be in one of the comparison groups.

While randomization is almost impossible in school settings, except for some within-program comparisons of materials or strategies, you might be able to find naturally occurring groups enrolled in similar bilingual programs whose near or whose differences along these dimensions could be factored out in the statistical analysis of one data equivalence in ses, language proficiency, and achievement could be documented.

Multiple Designs

The third concept is the use of multiple designs. No one data collection strategy can hope to address all evaluation concerns. You may even have to use more than one instrument to answer the same question. If you get a convergence of results from several sources, you then can rule out competing explanations. Some of these data collection plans will include random assignment of "treatments" (perhaps individualized learning packages) to students; others will involve interview, questionnaire, or observation data addressing the same question.

Although no one evaluation can hope to answer all relevant questions, the use of multiple instruments and multiple designs will slow you to investigate different facets of the same questions and different aspects of the same program in order to pinpoint program effects.

ACTIVITY 3: IDENTIFYING THE NECESSARY QUESTIONS

Read the District description provided in the Simulation. Work with others at your table to complete this Activity Sheet:

I. Who is most likely to need information provided by the evaluation? What are the following groups most likely to want to know about the program?

a. Parents

_____

_____

b. Teachers

_____

_____

c. Other school site staff and administrators

_____

_____

d. School Board

_____

_____

e. Funding Agency

_____

_____

Simulation Materials

The District

The _____ District has a bilingual program involving three elementary schools--Tally, Cedric, and Walpole, and the junior high school--Knoll. The elementary program is a transitional K-4 program. It has been in operation in Tally for one year, at Cedric for about four years, and at Walpole for about eight years.

There are approximately 330 elementary students in the bilingual program. Most of them (280) speak Swabe. The remaining students, 50, speak Ono. Students were selected on the basis of informal interviews by teachers, however, there is no documentation of this. Swabe is a widely spoken language and there are plenty of instructional assessment materials available, although much of it comes from a foreign country and needs adaptation. Materials in Ono are not as common, since this is a relatively small country. In fact, teachers have been making up their own materials for their students. The elementary bilingual program teaching staff consists of nine teachers. Five are bilingual Swabe/English and one is a bilingual Ono/English. Three teachers are in the process of learning Swabe to obtain certification as bilingual teachers. Each of the monolingual English speaking teachers is assisted by an aide. There are five aides in the program, four are bilingual Swabe/English and one is bilingual Ono/English.

There are approximately 123 junior high school students in the bilingual program. All of the students are speakers of Swabe. All students who are non-native English speakers are automatically placed in the regular

classroom. This determination must be made within a week of the student's enrollment at Knoll Junior High School.

There are three ESL teachers, and four bilingual teachers at Knoll.

ACTIVITY 4

Now read the elementary program objectives. Consider the audience, district setting and program objectives while you generate some evaluation questions about:

A. Teaching strategies

_____

_____

_____

B. Materials

_____

_____

_____

C. Student and staff attitude

_____

_____

_____

D. Program outcomes/effects

_____

_____

_____

E. Other activities in school/home that may influence program outcomes

_____

_____

_____

The Elementary Bilingual Program Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives of the bilingual program are:

1. To help the student attain sufficient competency in the English language to ensure his/her proficiency in all areas of academic concern.
2. To develop students' cognitive and academic skills in reading and math in English and the native language.
3. To develop student self-concept and cultural pride.
4. To create and maintain a project staff of teachers, paraprofessional aides, and administrators with a high degree of expertise in their respective fields.
5. To create and maintain inservice and other instructional programs for the staff in order to enrich their professional development.
6. To promote an active and positive relationship between the schools and the community.
7. To promote a mutual support and integration of the bilingual and monolingual English programs in the schools.

The Jr. High School Bilingual Program Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives for the junior high bilingual program are as follows:

1. Students will learn sufficient English language skills to enable them to receive instruction in the regular English program and perform successfully. This goal should be attained within one to two years after entering the program, depending on the student's level of entry skills in English, math, social studies, and science in the native language as well as reading comprehension and writing in the native language.
2. To develop student self-concept and cultural pride.
3. To develop student skills in academic areas such as social studies, math, science, etc. as well as in English language skills.

Activity 5:

SAMPLING AND INSTRUMENTATION PLAN

Evaluation Question	Group Sampled (number)	Instrument--Name: Contents
1. How well are students doing compared to _____ (complete comparison)		
2. Is the program being implemented as planned? (State what you will look at to determine this.)		
3. How can the program be improved? (State what you will look at to determine this.)		

Simulation for Activity 5:

SAMPLING AND INSTRUMENTATION PLAN

Evaluation Criteria for the Elementary Program

Exit criteria: This has been a source of confusion and contention among the bilingual program director, the principals and members of the school board. The board and some of the principals feel that students who achieve at the stanine in math and reading in English, should be transferred out of the bilingual program. They also feel that if a student has been in the bilingual program for two years, he/she should be ready to join the regular monolingual English program. The bilingual program director and some of the principals feel that these criteria are not adequate for several reasons. First of all, they feel that the standardized achievement test used to measure reading and math in English is biased against the bilingual program students, due to cultural bias in the items and their lack of relevance to the curriculum. Although they would agree to including student achievement scores in reading and math in English on a more appropriate standardized test, they feel that this would not be enough. In addition, they would like to administer an "exit" language proficiency test which would examine writing and listening comprehension in English as well as reading and speaking skills. They would also prefer to use a district developed criterion referenced test relevant to their curriculum in: language skills in English, and math, social studies and science in English or the native language. The purpose of this would be to see whether exiting students are entering the monolingual English program with the same kinds of skills and knowledge as their peers. Neither the bilingual program staff nor the monolingual English program staff has examined the similarities or differences between the curricula of the two programs. Although they both contain similar

(and in some cases the same) objectives, the instructional materials are different as are the teaching strategies. The present situation within the bilingual program is that each school has its own transfer criteria. In the older programs, such as those in Cedric and Walpole Elementary schools, students must exit the program after 2 1/2 years. Tally Elementary school has placed no time limit and relies on achievement scores and informal teacher assessment to determine transfer eligibility. No formal follow up procedures have been set up for the bilingual program students who have transferred.

Outcomes: Of the two schools, Cedric/Walpole Elementary schools have tested their students on a yearly basis with a standardized achievement test on reading and math in English. This has been done for students in grades 2, 3 and 4. Most of the bilingual program students have scored lower than the students in the monolingual English program. The gap widens as the children get older. The bilingual program director blames the inadequacy of the test and the newness of the programs for these results. Board members and principals have various opinions about how to go about improving student achievement. Some board members and principals feel that greater emphasis should be placed on English language skills in the curriculum and teaching strategies. Others feel that students need more strengthening of basic skills in their own language and in English before they can do well in the monolingual English program. Neither the board nor the majority of the principals have discussed this issue with the parental advisory board. The bilingual program director and the principal of Walpole Elementary feel that more parental involvement in the schools could indirectly and positively affect student achievement by improving

students' self-image and study habits at home. Some of the teachers and the bilingual program director feel that it is unfair to compare the performance of bilingual program and monolingual English program students.

Evaluation Criteria for the Junior High Program

Exit criteria: Students will be exited from the bilingual program upon fulfillment of the following criteria:

1. At least one year in the program.
2. Scores in the 3rd stanine on English language skills and math on the TUF standardized achievement test.
3. Satisfactory performance (or better) in a regular English program course.

The same controversies exist over these transitional criteria as for those of the elementary school program. The program director and principal are considering the deletion of #3 above because of possible traumatic effects on a student who "cannot make it" in regular classes. However, some of the board members feel that this is a good way to find out whether a student is ready to transition.

KINDS OF DATA* USEFUL IN PROGRAM EVALUATION	POSSIBLE MEANS OF DATA COLLECTION					
		Self-Report				
BACKGROUND DATA	Record-keeping	Oral	Questionnaire	Performance or achievement test	Interview	Observation
1. Student Data						
Educational history: locations, performance evaluations	✓					
Language dominance and proficiency pre-program	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Socio-economic status and parental occupation			✓		✓	
Siblings: grades, ages, important educational characteristics	✓		✓			
Special problems and remediation taken	✓	✓	✓	✓		
2. Program Data						
Past program conducted:	✓		✓			
Size: faculty and students	✓					
Type of population: language groups,	✓		✓			✓
Classroom processes	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Other pre-program data:	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Qualifications of teachers and aides	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Available resources: funds, resource personnel, space, equipment	✓					
3. Contextual Data						
Languages used in the community		✓	✓		✓	✓
SES of neighborhood	✓		✓		✓	✓
Nationalities represented in community (to determine appropriate cultural component for curriculum)	✓		✓		✓	✓
Past participation in the bilingual program		✓	✓		✓	✓
Political support in the community		✓	✓		✓	✓

*Please note: Each of three kinds of data (background, outcome and process) are further divided into three types: student, program, and contextual sources.

KINDS OF DATA USEFUL IN PROGRAM EVALUATION	POSSIBLE MEANS OF DATA COLLECTION					
		Self-Report		Performance		
	Record-keeping	Oral	Questionnaire	or achievement test	Interview	Observation
OUTCOME DATA						
1. Student Data						
Reading and mathematics achievement in English and native language	✓			✓		
Attitude toward native language and English		✓	✓		✓	✓
Attitude toward the bilingual program		✓	✓		✓	✓
Attitude toward school		✓	✓		✓	✓
School attendance record	✓					
Library use and type of materials checked out	✓					✓
Teacher observation of class participation	✓		✓			✓
Teacher observation of behavior change: records or graphs of certain desirable or undesirable behaviors	✓					✓
Student self-assessments of like/dislike of program components		✓	✓		✓	
2. Program Data						
Resources received/used: funds, personnel and their time, space, equipment ordered and how placed	✓		✓		✓	
Attendance of teachers and aides	✓					
Administrative assistance: amount of time from each source: school, district, state, regional	✓		✓			
Attitudes of teachers and aides toward each language, the bilingual program, and other school characteristics		✓	✓		✓	
Number of bilingual classes, number of students assigned to each class and basis for assignment (may be language survey results or scores on some screening device)	✓		✓		✓	✓
3. Contextual Data						
Rates of participation in the program by various groups in the community	✓	✓	✓		✓	

KINDS OF DATA USEFUL IN PROGRAM EVALUATION	POSSIBLE MEANS OF DATA COLLECTION					
		Self-Report		Performance		
	Record-keeping	Oral	Questionnaire	or achievement test	Interview	Observation
Documentation of counseling activities. Formal and informal, by peers, teacher and others.	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Extra-curricular activities. What goes on with whom. Sports programs, clubs, parties, and other social activities	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
2. Program-Related Data and Contextual Data						
Means used to arrive at program goals and objectives	✓		✓		✓	
Means used to arrive at performance standards	✓		✓		✓	
Processes used to confer with resource personnel (e.g., weekly meetings whereby principal discussed cumulative files with reading specialist)	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Activities of community participants. Advisory panel meeting minutes or record of how volunteers spent their time in the classroom.	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Duties and actual activities of school administrators in working with the bilingual program	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓

KINDS OF DATA USEFUL IN PROGRAM EVALUATION	POSSIBLE MEANS OF DATA COLLECTION					
		Self-Report		Performance		
	Record-keeping	Oral	Questionnaire	or achievement test	Interview	Observation
Support for the program from state and local sources: political and attitudinal support (may be difficult to document), funds and manpower	✓		✓		✓	
Community attitude toward language groups served, bilingual program and education		✓	✓		✓	
Community resources used (e.g., number of visits to employers in the community; use of the park, field trips to local sites, visits to the school by representatives of the community, etc.)	✓		✓			
PROCESS DATA						
1. Student-Related Data						
Observations of student interactions with each other (rated for frequency, content, complexity, etc.)						✓
Daily schedule of activities: those conducted for the whole class by the teacher; those conducted in small groups by the teacher, aides or volunteers, independent activities	✓		✓			✓
Use of native language and English in the classroom. Percentages of time when each language is used; content areas. Method of communication used routinely.	✓		✓		✓	✓
Comparison of stated objectives and means of achieving these with objectives worked toward, and means used	✓		✓		✓	
Role of personnel in the classroom (teachers, aides, volunteers) by content area or subject matter					✓	✓
Changes over the semester or school year in procedures used	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Reading and Language Arts curriculum: materials used day by day, means of communicating concepts, methods used to provide practice (e.g., reading groups, audio-visual equipment, one-to-one reading, etc.)	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Documentation of cross-age or other tutoring. Students and others involved, nature of the tutoring, frequency, response of student and tutors to content and procedures.	✓		✓		✓	✓

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP

Workshop title: _____

Position/Job title: _____

Date: _____

Please place a check in the space below each question that summarizes your opinion about the materials used for this workshop.

I. 1. The materials are helpful for evaluators who are not familiar with specific problems in evaluating compensatory and specially funded programs.

_____very _____adequately _____somewhat _____not at all

2. The materials are helpful for people with no experience in evaluation.

_____very _____adequately _____somewhat _____not at all

3. The purpose of the workshop was communicated clearly in the materials.

_____yes _____no

4. Content was presented in a logical, easy to follow order.

_____yes _____no

5. The order of presentation of topics in the text promoted retention.

_____very much _____adequately _____somewhat _____not at all

6. The content in the workshop was new to you.

_____yes, completely _____yes, mostly _____no, most was familiar; no, all familiar

7. The language of the materials was appropriate for the audience.

_____yes _____no

II. 1. How practical do you think the information in the text is to your evaluation on training needs?

_____very _____rather _____difficult to see its use _____no utility

2. What would be your recommendation to a colleague regarding these materials?

_____strongly recommend _____recommend _____not recommend

_____strongly not recommend

III. COMMENTS

1. What are the strongest sections of the text? _____

_____

_____

2. What are the weakest sections of the text? _____

_____

_____

3. What topics need to be included? _____

_____

_____

4. Other _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____